



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI.—ASOKAN MISCELLANY.

1. MUNISA-.

I note with great pleasure that Professor Wackernagel, in his article 'Indoiranica' (ZvergSp. 43) p. 297, in a footnote, remarks "Mi. *munisa-* neben *manusa-* usw. ist gewiss eine Nachbildung nach *purisa-*". Though I anticipated him in this (see IF. 23, pp. 254-256; JAOS. 30, p. 90, footnote 3), he arrived at this conclusion quite independently, which confirms my conjecture.

2. KĀLSĪ *ṣunā*.

Formerly (IF. 23, p. 260) I thought that Kālsī *ṣunā* should be united with Prākṛit *uṇā* from **ṣunāt* (see Pischel, Gr., § 342 near the end). It is objectionable to assume for Middle Indic words and forms prototypes other than for the correspondents in Sanskrit unless the phonetics of the Middle Indic dialects demand them; and in this particular instance it is especially easy to follow the Sanskrit. *Punā* (Pkt. *uṇā* is a later development of this due to specific Pkt. phonetics) is simply an analogical extension of *ṣunā* in such combinations as *ṣunā ramate* = *ṣunar* + *ramate*.

3. A COUPLE OF NOTES ON THE 5TH ROCK-EDICT.

The fifth sentence of the Gīrnār redaction of this edict runs: *Ta mama putā ca potrā ca paraṃ ca tena ya me apacaṃ āva samvaṭakapā anuvatisare tathā so sukaṭaṃ kāsati*. Now *so—kāsati* (singulārs) are manifestly unsuitable. Plurals are surely called; witness the respective correspondents of the Shāhbāzgarhi, Kālsī, and Dhāuli redactions: *te sukaṭ[r]aṃ kaṣaṃti*, *se sukaṭaṃ kachaṃti*, *se (suka) ṭaṃ kach(aṃ)ti*. The truth is that Gīrnār *so—kāsati* is a corruption due to *so—kāsati* of the next sentence: *Yo tu eta desaṃ pi hāpesati so dukataṃ kāsati*, in which *so—kāsati* is perfectly correct; cf. Shb. *so [du]kaṭaṃ kaṣati*, K. *se dukataṃ kachati*, Dh. *se (d)ukaṭaṃ kach(a)ti*. On such faulty assimilations see Lanman, Album-Kern, p. 303 and on AV. 18.4.87.

We have a similar error in Kālsī [*hā*]pa[*y*]isaṃti in the sentence: *E cu hetā desaṃ pi[hā]pa[y]ayisaṃti se dukataṃ kachati*, as is shown by Gīrnār *hāpesati*, Shb. [*hāpeṣati*], Dh.

hāpayisat(i). The plural for singular is due to the plurals *anuvaṭisamti*, *kachamti* of the preceding sentence [Shb. *an. vatiśamti*, *kaṣamti*; G. *anuvatisare*; Dh. *anuvatisamti(i)*, *kach(am)ti*]. It should be said that Bühler previously said that the anusvāra of K. [*hā*]pa[*y*]isamti should probably be deleted; and so very nearly hit the mark.

The Mansehra text in the corresponding passages is of no value for the points at issue. The forms lack anusvāras in all cases; but *m* is so often graphically omitted that it would be rash to say that *anuva* [*t*]iṣati and the first *kaṣati* are merely textual errors. It may be remarked that *se* (which occurs twice) is a 'Māgadhism'.

On *se* as the subject of Kālsī *kachamti* and Dh. *kach(am)ti*, see the next study.

4. A SUPPOSED VEDIC ARCHAISM IN THE INSCRIPTIONS OF ASOKA.

In the third study we quoted Kālsī *se sukaṭam kachamti* and Dhauli *se (sukā)ṭam kach(am)ti*. It should be remarked that *se* in these cases is a nominative plural and not a nominative singular. In a word we have the same extension of the stem *sa-* as we have in Vedic *sasmin*. The *se* is not a textual error, due to *se* as a nom. sing. of the next sentence [Kālsī *se dukaṭam kachati*, Dhauli *se (d)ukaṭam kach(a)ti*] as is clear from the fact that in the Mansehra version we find the 'Māgadhism' *se* both times in the corresponding passages. So it is certain that the *se* as a nom. pl. stood in the 'Māgadhan' original; for it is inconceivable that the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction should have a plural *te* if the 'Magadhan' original did not have a plural; and that this plural was *se* cannot be denied in view of Kālsī, Dhauli, Mansehra *se*. Moreover with the assumption of *se* as a nom. pl., Gīrnār *so sukaṭam kāsati* it is easier to explain. The scribe simply mistranslated the nom. pl. *se* by *so* because *se* as a nom. sing. was *so* in the Gīrnār dialect. Then of course *so sukaṭam *kāsamti* inevitably would be altered to *so sukaṭam kāsati* (see above).

The Dhauli redaction at v. 24 and v. 25 has the following expression *viyāpaṭā se* which is very embarrassing. Franke proposed to join *viyāpaṭāse*, making *-āse* the equivalent of Vedic *-āsas*. This at once removes all difficulties; and is especially commendable from the fact that in Prakrit we have traces of the same formation. At the same time I would point out that corre-

sponding to Dhauli *viyāpaṭā se* at v. 24 we have Gīrnār *vyāpatā te*, Shāhbāzgarhi *vapaṭa [te]*, Mansehra *viyapaṭa te*, Kālsī *viyāpaṭā te*; and to Dhauli *viyāpaṭā se* at v. 25 we have Gīrnār *vyāpatā te*, Shāhbāzgarhi *viyapaṭra*,¹ Mansehra *viyapaṭa te*, Kālsī *viyāpaṭā te*. Since *se* as a nom. pl. is found in the Dhauli redaction, it seems to me far better to take *se* in the two passages under discussion as the equivalent of the *te* of the other versions rather than to join *-āse* and to take this as the equivalent of Vedic *-āsas*. Of course the versions do not always agree in the wording [e. g. Gīrnār *vyāpatā te*, v. 8 = Shb. *viyapaṭ[a]*, Mans. *viyapaṭa*, K. *viyāpaṭā*, Dh. (*viyāpa*)*tā*], and it may be urged that *viyāpaṭā se* at Dh. v. 25 may be *viyāpaṭāse* as in this case the Shb. redaction has no correspondent to the *te* of G., Mans. and K. Yet the fact that at Dh. v. 26 we have *ime* in *viyāpaṭā ime* corresponding to *te* in G. [**vyāpatā*t*]*e*, Shb. *viyapaṭa te*, Mans. *vapaṭa [te]*, Kālsī *viyāpaṭā te* is decidedly against this. For here we have an unquestioned and unquestionable nom. pl. *ime* corresponding to *te* of the other versions. It is true that in the seventh Pillar-Edict the Delhi Sivalik text has *viyāpaṭā se* three times; and here again Franke would join *viyāpaṭāse*.² The passages are DS. vii³. 4 (twice) and 6. The first time where we have *viyāpaṭā se* there is no question but that as a separate word *se* is wholly out of place, and here we might be tempted to read *-āse* as a nom. pl.; but in the second passage there is no necessity for not taking *se* as a separate word (nom. pl.); in the third *se* as a separate word is unsuitable; *-āse* would answer nicely. But the trouble is that we have no other redactions to check the Delhi Sivalik text as we have in respect to the Dhauli version of the Fourteen Edicts³; and it should be observed that although the dialects of both the Delhi Sivalik redaction of the Pillar-Edicts and the Dhauli recension of the Fourteen-Edicts are 'Māgadhaṇ', yet they are not absolutely identical; it might be that Vedic *-āsas* survived in DS. *-āse* but was lost in Dh.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

BUREAU OF AMERICAN ETHNOLOGY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

¹ On Shb. *viyapaṭra*, etc., see Michelson, AJP. 30, pp. 426, 427.

² I formerly (IF. 23, p. 248) accepted this.

³ Bühler was well aware that in the first and last passage *se* was bothersome and called it 'redundant'. I cannot make out if he thought it a mere error.